

State of Michigan
John Engler, Governor

Department of Environmental Quality



Russell J. Harding, Director

INTERNET: <http://www.deq.state.mi.us>

State Revolving Fund (SRF)
Final Intended Use Plan - Fiscal Year 1999

Prepared by:
Municipal Facilities Section, Environmental Assistance Division
October, 1998

The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) will not discriminate against any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, national origin, color, marital status, disability or political beliefs. Questions or concerns should be directed to the MDEQ Office of Personnel Services, P.O. Box 30473, Lansing, MI 48909.
--

SRF SRF SRF SRF SRF SRF

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Structure of the SRF	3
III.	Advantages of the SRF	4
IV.	Changes in the SRF	5
V.	Project Priority	6
VI.	Long Term Goals	6
VII.	Short Term Goals	7
VIII.	Allocation of Funds	8
IX.	Assurances	8
X.	Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds	9
XI.	EPA Automated Clearing House Activities	9
XII.	Public Review and Comment	10
XIII.	Origination of Documents	11

I. INTRODUCTION

The State of Michigan provides a low-interest loan financing program to assist qualified local municipalities with the construction of needed water pollution control facilities. Michigan's fund is officially known as the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund. Since its inception in 1989, however, the fund has more commonly been referred to as the **State Revolving Fund, or SRF**.

This is an important distinction to be made now that Michigan has also established a similar financing program for drinking water projects. The new **Drinking Water Revolving Fund (DWRF)** will allow staff of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to apply to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for capitalization grant funds.

While these two programs will run on parallel tracks, there will be some differences in their requirements. It is imperative that interested parties work with DEQ staff to increase their knowledge of these differences. This Intended Use Plan (IUP) will focus from this point forward on the SRF.

Michigan's SRF program is used by local municipalities to finance construction of their water pollution control projects. These may include wastewater treatment plant upgrades or expansions, combined sewer overflow abatement, new sewers designed to reduce existing sources of pollution, non point source pollution management measures, and other related wastewater treatment efforts. Qualified municipalities must meet federal and state program requirements, as well as demonstrate their ability to publicly finance their project.

The SRF is a state-managed program. This Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 IUP describes how the DEQ and the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority (Authority) will jointly administer the SRF during the upcoming fiscal year. The Municipal Facilities Section (MFS) of the Environmental Assistance Division (EAD) is charged with carrying out the program administration responsibilities. Financial administration of the program continues to be handled by the staff of the Authority. The administrative contacts for the SRF are as follows:

Ms. Janet Hunter Moore, Executive Director
Michigan Municipal Bond Authority
Michigan Department of Treasury
Treasury Building
Lansing, MI 48922
517-373-1728

Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief
Municipal Facilities Section
Environmental Assistance Division
Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30457
Lansing, MI 48909-7957
Voice: 517-373-2161
E-Mail: kamppint@deq.state.mi.us

The EPA continues to offer guidance and annual program oversight reviews which strengthens the management of the SRF and helps to ensure consistent application of federal requirements.

II. STRUCTURE OF THE SRF

From 1989 through 1992, Michigan's SRF operated as a direct loan program. Municipalities requested reimbursement for project costs and draws were processed directly upon federal and state funds as they were requested. Since 1992, however, the state has sold State Revolving Fund Revenue Bonds which are covered with a reserve drawn directly from federal and state funds.

Issuance costs are covered by the bonds sold and, thus, are not identified as direct administrative expenses of the SRF. These costs have historically approximated one percent of the total issue.

Currently, Moody's Investor Services and Standard & Poors have rated the SRF bonds AA1 and AA+, respectively. These ratings reflect the market's confidence in the sound programmatic and financial administration of the SRF program. Six separate revenue bond issues have been successfully marketed to date.

1992A Series	November 19, 1992	\$ 92,455,500
1993 Series	December 16, 1993	\$101,820,000
1994 Series	January 5, 1995	\$ 87,280,000
1996B Series	August 29, 1996	\$ 86,290,000
1996A Refinancing	August 29, 1996	\$ 86,750,000 (<i>Defeased all outstanding 1992A and 1994 series bonds.</i>)
1997	July 1, 1997	\$132,500,000
1998	August 6, 1998	\$153,025,000

It is from these bond issues that reimbursements are drawn for the local units of government. Concurrently, the EPA and state funds are deposited into the debt service reserve accounts which provide coverage for the revenue bonds. A diagram of the flow of funds is included as Attachment 1.

Michigan has requested and received federal capitalization grants from the EPA since FY1989. This federal contribution has been significant, amounting to over \$690,599,066 to date. These funds, matched by a 20 percent contribution from state sources, have created the capital pool from which the low-interest loans could be made. In addition, release funds from the reserve accounts become available as coverage requirements lapse on each bond issue sold. These moneys then become available for commitment to municipalities, along with interest and principal repayments.

The following summarizes the yearly capital contributions of both the federal and state governments, as well as municipal repayments expected:

FY	Federal Cap Grant	State Match	Total Cap Grant	Muni. Interest Repay on Loans	Muni. Principal Repay on Loans	Total Available Funds
1989-98	\$624,939,362	\$125,076,446	\$750,015,808	\$40,171,722	\$ 83,398,315	\$873,585,845
1999	\$ 65,659,704	\$ 13,131,940	\$ 78,791,644	\$ 8,500,000*	\$ 26,000,000*	\$113,291,644
TOTALS	\$690,599,066	\$138,208,386	\$828,807,452	\$48,671,722	\$109,398,315	\$986,877,489

*denotes estimates

III. ADVANTAGES OF THE SRF

The primary advantage to Michigan municipalities is the ability to borrow funds well below the market rate. As the program began, loans were offered with a 2 percent rate of interest. At the start of FY1995, this was raised to 2.25 percent. Since the fund's inception, open market rates have ranged from 5.16 to 8 percent. The relative stability of the SRF has allowed communities to more adequately plan without factoring in major market rate adjustments.

The SRF interest rate is established prior to each new fiscal year. The decision is based on demand, market conditions, program costs, and future structuring needs. After considering the variables listed in Part 53 of Act 451, PA 1994, the DEQ director established the interest rate for all SRF loans offered during FY1999 at 2.5 percent.

Apart from the low interest, municipalities also benefit from the SRF in that they can finance all eligible water pollution control costs. They often do not have to seek other sources or enter the market to obtain local share financing. Everything is handled by this “one-stop shopping” concept. The amount of time it takes to commence construction is greatly reduced. This streamlined approach has resulted in lower bid costs because of the tighter timeframe. It has removed the unexpected elements that occurred when communities would obtain a grant and then have to secure financing for the local share.

The SRF can also be used to fund qualified projects to abate non point sources (NPS) of pollution. The DEQ director may allocate funds between traditional point source projects and the NPS projects such as urban and agricultural runoff. There continues to be little interest from local units of government to finance projects for NPS pollution control through the SRF. The impediment likely results from the difficulty of generating a viable source of repayments for NPS projects.

EPA has noted the difficulty encountered by the states in finding viable NPS projects to include on the SRF Project Priority List (PPL). EPA is encouraging states to step up recruitment of such projects in order to focus more effort on reducing NPS pollution, now that more point source abatement projects have been funded through the SRF and its predecessor, the Construction Grants Program.

The DEQ will continue to make loans available to any Section 319 NPS project within the fundable range that can meet program requirements. However, no project plans were submitted for FY1999 NPS projects before the July 1, 1998 submittal deadline.

IV. CHANGES IN THE SRF

There have been no major changes in Michigan’s SRF since last year, but the DEQ continues to pursue one significant modification to the program in FY1999. This change will consist of implementing EPA’s Hardship Grants Program for Rural Communities by modifying Michigan’s SRF to permit the award of additional assistance to qualifying communities.

The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-134) contained a \$50 million appropriation for a Hardship Grants Program, and federal guidance published on March 20, 1997 provides basic implementation detail. There were no additional funds appropriated in FY1997 or FY1998, and it is uncertain whether appropriations in FY1999 and beyond will be made. Michigan’s share of the FY1996 appropriation is \$2,280,700, and when supplemented with the required 5 percent state match, results in \$2,394,735 of hardship assistance being available to municipalities participating in the SRF.

The Hardship Grants Program will remain directly tied to Michigan’s SRF and available funds will be used to provide supplemental financial assistance to qualifying communities at the time of loan award. This assistance will be in the form of principal forgiveness for that part of a community’s SRF loan expended on engineering services to complete project planning and prepare construction documents. In this fashion, the state will provide the equivalent of incremental grant assistance to

“hardship” communities without saddling the local unit of government with any additional program compliance responsibilities over and above those required by the SRF. The DEQ will submit a federal grant application for these hardship funds and will establish program specific detail in that document.

To qualify for hardship assistance, a municipality must:

1. Have its project in the fundable range on the PPL for the fiscal year;
2. Be a “rural” community with no more than 3,000 inhabitants;
3. Lack centralized wastewater treatment or collection systems;
4. Be located in a county with a per capita income that does not exceed 80 percent of the national average as determined by the last available U.S. Census; and
5. Be located in a county with an average unemployment rate that exceeds the national average by one percentage point or more for the July through June period preceding the start of the fiscal year.

V. PROJECT PRIORITY

The state Clean Water Assistance Act, now codified in Part 53, Clean Water Assistance, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, requires the SRF to offer assistance in priority order from the state’s annual PPL. The criteria used to prioritize the projects are contained in the Act, with details set forth in administrative rules (R323.951 to R323.965).

This final FY1999 IUP and PPL includes projects seeking Orders of Approval (the state’s binding commitment) between October 1, 1998 and September 30, 1999. Upon completion of the federal appropriation process, letters were sent on October 20, 1998, to those on the PPL to identify the fundable and contingency projects. The attached charts summarize information about this year’s projects, including their expected funding amounts. Communities with projects in the fundable range must negotiate a milestone schedule with the MFS project manager assigned to their project.

Historically, many projects in the contingency range of the PPL have been funded when others in the fundable range fail to satisfactorily meet program requirements in a timely manner. Therefore, it is imperative that municipal officials work closely with the DEQ and the Authority to ensure that no opportunity for funding is lost.

NOTE: There is no actual or implied guarantee that inclusion on the PPL or the IUP will constitute a commitment of financial assistance from the SRF. All program requirements must be satisfied before a binding commitment will be offered and a loan closed.

VI. LONG-TERM GOALS

Michigan’s SRF is a primary funding source used to protect and preserve the water resources within the state’s boundaries. As more and more attention is given to water pollution abatement efforts within specific watersheds, the DEQ will continue to work toward establishing tighter

integration of the federal/state/local partnership. This includes efforts to satisfy EPA that the pace of Michigan's SRF is satisfactory.

The DEQ has expressed its willingness to work together with various federal and state agencies, such as the Rural Development Authority and the Michigan Jobs Commission, so that our agencies may collectively fund applicants and maximize use of our capital pool to protect our water resources.

Such protection of the state's waters will ultimately benefit everyone. Industry, tourism, and day-to-day quality of life are strengthened when our most valuable natural resource is preserved for our use and enjoyment. This includes improvement of existing surface waters which suffer impairment, protection of groundwater resources from improperly treated discharges, reduction of harmful discharges from combined sewer overflows, and the protection of aquatic ecosystems which cannot thrive in conditions of degraded water quality. To this end, long-term goals for Michigan's SRF are:

- A. To achieve and maintain statewide compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules and standards.
- B. To protect the public health and environmental quality of our state.
- C. To further integrate principles of watershed management and water quality restoration within urban, as well as outstate areas.
- D. To secure Michigan's full share of federal funding available under Title VI and to expeditiously obligate these moneys, along with the state contributions, for the construction of water pollution control projects which meet state and federal requirements.
- E. To maintain an effective program of community environmental education, outreach, and involvement within watersheds.
- F. To develop strategies within the SRF to assist smaller, hardship communities in meeting water quality standards.
- G. To ensure that the pace of the SRF program satisfies EPA requirements.

VII. SHORT-TERM GOALS

In order to accomplish the long-term goals, we must also focus on more immediate objectives. Therefore, our short-term goals for FY1999 are:

- A. To continue on-going revisions to the SRF Procedures Manual. This is a continual process involving staff and management effort to review and redraft chapters to reflect changes in operational procedures of managing the SRF. This will result in improved efficiency and effectiveness of the program.
- B. Establish a small community hardship assistance program.

- C. Identify and integrate, wherever possible, outreach efforts focused on pollution prevention activities.
- D. To fund those projects identified in the IUP, enabling them to proceed with construction of facilities included in their adopted project plans.
- E. Work with other agencies and offices in developing integrated approaches in watershed management efforts.
- F. Coordinate disbursement practices with the DEQ's Office of Financial Services to ensure accurate reporting of program information for administrative/project expenditures.

VIII. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Allocation of funds among eligible uses is based on a three-step process. First, the DEQ identifies the sources of funds and the spending limits for the SRF within the given fiscal year. Next, a determination of the type and amount of funding assistance necessary for each community is made. Finally, SRF funds are allocated among the projects consistent with amounts available and the priority ranking of the project.

The following information reflects the estimated sources of funds from which communities may draw assistance during FY1999:

FY1999 Title VI Funds	\$ 57,904,704
FY1999 Section 205(m) Transfer Funds	\$ 7,755,000
FY1999 State Match	\$ 13,131,940
 Carryover from previous year	 \$ 40,671,000
 Anticipated Earnings & Funds Released from Debt Service Reserve	 \$ 91,364,000
Repayments of Principal and Interest to the SRF	<u>\$ 35,000,000</u>
 Total Sources of Funds for FY1999	 \$245,826,644

From these funds, however, the costs of administering the SRF are also drawn. As permitted in Section 603(d)(7) of the federal Clean Water Act, Michigan will continue to reserve up to 4 percent of the cumulative federal capitalization amounts to cover the administrative expenses of operating the SRF (\$2,161,600). Allowing for bid overruns (\$24,665,044), we anticipate providing up to \$219 million for project funding during FY1999. These funds will be drawn by the DEQ and the Authority throughout the fiscal year to cover administrative costs and project reimbursements.

IX. ASSURANCES

The final guidelines from the EPA set forth provisions that the state must provide certain assurances in order to qualify for capitalization grant funding. Such assurances are incorporated into the Operating Agreement and are included here by reference.

X. CRITERIA AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The State of Michigan will provide financial assistance from the SRF to municipalities in the relative order that they appear on the PPL developed for the fiscal year covered by this IUP. It is probable, however, that lower-ranked communities will receive money sooner if higher-ranked communities are not ready to proceed.

As a result of the DEQ's review, 36 projects totaling \$359.65 million are expected to proceed this fiscal year and are included on the FY1999 PPL. Staff also identified 9 projects and/or segments equaling \$1.143 billion which will be considered for funding in the future.

Thus, 45 different projects totaling \$1,502,290,000 are identified on Part I of the PPL, along with a brief description, their total priority points, population to be served, targeted binding commitment date, and targeted binding commitment amount. Part II of the PPL identifies the appropriate categories in which each project received points.

The FY1999 PPL is included as part of the IUP process, and was presented as part of the public hearing. A separate copy of the final PPL is available from the MFS.

Section 5309 of 1994 PA 451 permits the DEQ to limit funding in certain circumstances to maximize funds and achieve greater environmental gains. It reads:

To ensure that a disproportionate share of available funds for a given fiscal year is not committed to a single sewage treatment work project or storm water project, the department may segment a sewage treatment work project if either of the following criteria is present:

(a) The cost of the proposed project is more than 30 percent of the amount available in the fund.

(b) Upon application of a municipality, the department has approved a municipality's application for segmenting a project.

Financial assistance to municipalities during FY1999 will consist solely of straight loans. There will be no guarantees of indebtedness.

XI. EPA-AUTOMATED CLEARING HOUSE ACTIVITIES

The EPA employs an Automated Clearing House (ACH) to make disbursements of federal funds to the SRF. For FY1999 Michigan anticipates drawing on the ACH according to the following schedule:

1st Quarter	-	\$15 million	Request processing - first quarter, FY1999
2nd Quarter		\$15 million	Request processing - second quarter, FY1999
3rd Quarter	-	\$25 million	Request processing - third quarter, FY1999
4th Quarter	-	\$10.66 million	Request processing - fourth quarter, FY1999

As project (or program administrative) costs are incurred, one request for disbursement may be submitted by the local project's authorized representative (or state agencies) each month. The request for disbursement of funds will be sent directly to the DEQ, who will then process the

request as part of a weekly draw request. Upon delivery to its office, the Authority will execute the fund drawdown electronically by transferring money from the federal ACH and state accounts. These amounts are generally drawn at 83.3 percent and 16.7 percent, respectively. However, these rates may be adjusted due to debt servicing requirements for the sale of state tax exempt bond issues related to the SRF.

Moneys will be automatically deposited into the debt service reserve account of the SRF, while funds are electronically wired to the municipality's bank from an SRF account which holds funds from a taxable state issue.

XII. PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

In order to satisfy public participation requirements, the DEQ conducted a public hearing on the IUP and PPL on September 15, 1998 at 1:30 p.m. in Lansing, Michigan. This hearing was announced in newspapers throughout the state, published in the DEQ Calendar of Events, individually noticed to each municipality on the proposed FY1999 PPL along with their consulting engineer, and sent to interested parties.

Items addressed in the public hearing included Michigan's PPL, IUP, priority point assignment, planned funding schedules, and proposed binding commitment amounts for projects which might be assisted with SRF moneys during FY1999. This hearing provided an opportunity for municipalities and other interested parties to comment and request changes to their projects' ranking criteria, if necessary.

The information contained in the accompanying charts will be useful for those interested in reviewing project data. Chart 1 shows the binding commitment dates, construction start dates and binding commitment amounts. Chart 2 provides a breakdown of category cost dollars consistent with EPA definitions (i.e. treatment, rehab, combined sewer overflows, etc.). Chart 3 reflects the type of assistance, NPDES Permit Number, Facilities Needs Number, and whether the project had a previous segment funded within the prior three years. Finally, Chart 4 identifies the quarterly funding breakdown expected during the fiscal year.

Questions about the public hearing, the final PPL, or the final IUP may be directed to:

**Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief
Municipal Facilities Section
Environmental Assistance Division
Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30457
Lansing, MI 48909
Telephone: 517-373-2161
Fax: 517-335-0743
E-Mail: kamppint@deq.state.mi.us**

XIII. ORIGINATION OF DOCUMENTS

The Chief of the Municipal Facilities Section of the Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for issuing the Intended Use Plan. The IUP and its accompanying information were prepared by the Technical Support Unit. It is a collaborative effort of MFS staff who provide data for its development. Questions specific to the structure or content of text or numbers, may be directed to Mr. Kamppinen.



MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SECTION, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PHONE: 517-373-216)

Michigan Clean Water State Revolving Fund

Loan Assistance Ranking For Wastewater Treatment Works Projects

Final Fiscal Year 1999 Project Priority List By Rank

Reported on: 10/02/1998 3:51:06 PM

Page 1 of 2

Rank	Project Number	Project Name And Description			Water Quality Severity Points						Enf Pts	Pop. Pts	Pop. Pts	Exist. Disch	Rec Waters	Dil. Ratio	Rat. Pts	Tot Pts	Bind.Com Date	Bind.Com. Amt.
					DO	NUT	TOX	MICR	GWD	Tot										
1	5148-02	Mt Clemens	Macomb Co	CSO; Swr Sep: Seg 2	14	27	0	25	0	66	300	17926	85	0.329	0	3290.0000	100	551	03/05/1999	\$10,850,000
2	5129-03	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	CSO;Swr Sep-Future Segments	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	9323	80	0.043	78000	0.0000	25	433	Future	\$11,210,000
3	5145-03	Manistee	Manistee Co	CSO;Swr Sep-Seg 3	0	0	0	27	0	27	300	7805	80	0.116	1820	0.0001	25	432	09/03/1999	\$1,750,000
3	5145-04	Manistee	Manistee Co	CSO;Sew Sep-Future Segments	0	0	0	27	0	27	300	7805	80	0.116	1820	0.0001	25	432	Future	\$1,000,000
4	5120-01	Ontonagon	Ontonagon Co	Stab Lag; Swr Rehab; Seg 1 (Refinance)	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	2042	60	0.019	710	0.0000	25	413	11/24/1998	\$3,080,000
5	5154-02	Southfield	Oakland Co	CS-Seg 2	1	0	0	37	0	38	0	5000	75	0.005	2.8	0.0018	40	153	05/25/1999	\$14,970,000
5	5154-03	Southfield	Oakland Co	CS-Seg 3	1	0	0	37	0	38	0	5000	75	0.005	2.8	0.0018	40	153	Future	\$14,530,000
5	5154-04	Southfield	Oakland Co	CS-Seg 1A	1	0	0	37	0	38	0	5000	75	0.005	2.8	0.0018	40	153	11/24/1998	\$12,280,000
PROJECTS WITHOUT PRIOR YEAR SEGMENTS																				
6	5175-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	Seg 1 CSO: Leib & St Aubin Scrn/Disinf Facs	100	100	0	28	0	228	300	3100000	100	24.17	54	0.4476	85	713	09/03/1999	\$27,950,000
6	5175-02	Detroit	Wayne Co	Seg 2 CSO:Future Segments	100	100	0	28	0	228	300	3100000	100	24.17	54	0.4476	85	713	Future	\$929,050,000
7	5117-01	Wayne Co	Southgate-Wyandotte	Flow Contrl	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	05/25/1999	\$670,000
7	5117-20	Wayne Co	Downriver	Eureka Relief Sewer Extention	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	03/05/1999	\$16,680,000
7	5117-34	Wayne Co	Downriver	System Monitoring Program/O & M Manual	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	1.5884	100	625	09/03/1999	\$4,050,000
8	5005-11	Lansing	Ingham Co	Seg 11 CSO; Swr Sep	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	03/05/1999	\$13,800,000
8	5005-12	Lansing	Ingham Co	CSO; Swr Sep - Future Segments	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	Future	\$118,675,000
9	5006-01	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	CSO; Swr Sep; Seg. 1, Phase 1 (26, 29, 31, 32)	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	03/05/1999	\$11,975,000
9	5006-02	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	CSO; Swr Sep; Future Segments	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	Future	\$53,780,000
10	5126-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	PC 693-Dechlorination	0	0	50	0	0	50	300	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	520	03/05/1999	\$17,835,000
11	5144-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	Chlorination Facility	0	0	0	27	0	27	300	3100000	100	775	33924	0.0228	70	497	09/03/1999	\$18,000,000
12	5170-01	Saginaw	Saginaw Co.	CSO; Salt-Fraser Phase B RTB Upgrd/Expnd	0	6	0	27	0	33	300	23000	90	0.95	980	0.0010	40	463	05/25/1999	\$18,790,000
13	5143-01	Detroit	Wayne Co	2nd Det Riv Outfall - Seg 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3100000	100	2.6	650	0.0040	55	455	05/25/1999	\$50,000,000
13	5143-02	Detroit	Wayne Co	2nd Det Riv Outfall - Future Segs	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3100000	100	2.6	650	0.0040	55	455	Future	\$5,890,000
14	5127-01	Trenton	Wayne Co	Relief Swrs; RTB Expnd; CS & Int Upgrds-Seg 1	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	20586	85	0.09	200	0.0004	40	453	05/25/1999	\$30,010,000
14	5127-02	Trenton	Wayne Co	Relief Swrs; Solids Imp; CS & Int Upgrds - Future	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	20586	85	0.09	200	0.0004	40	453	Future	\$4,590,000
15	5182-01	Grosse Pte Farms	Wayne	CSO Swr Sep	0	2	0	27	0	29	300	10092	85	0.345	198000	0.0000	25	439	05/25/1999	\$13,865,000
16	5160-01	Springport	Jackson Co	WWTP Upgrd/Expnd (w/ SW Disc)	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	707	45	0.816	999999	0.0000	25	370	05/25/1999	\$610,000
17	5146-01	Beulah	Benzie Co	CS;WWTP	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	506	40	0.178	999999	0.0000	25	365	09/03/1999	\$1,760,000
18	5172-01	Imlay City	Lapeer Co	WWTP Upgrd & Expnd; Swr Sep	3	2	3	1	0	9	0	2921	70	0.56	0.5	1.1198	100	179	05/25/1999	\$3,100,000
19	5173-01	Leoni Twp	Jackson Co	WWTP Expnd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18580	85	0.51	4.7	0.1085	85	170	05/25/1999	\$2,190,000
20	5169-01	Mt. Pleasant	Isabella County	WWTP Expnd	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	41339	90	3.5	73	0.0479	70	166	05/25/1999	\$6,050,000
21	5183-01	Trenton	Wayne Co	WWTP Solids Handling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20586	85	5.06	170	0.0298	70	155	Future	\$3,915,000
22	5103-01	Flint	Genesee Co	Storage Bldg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140775	95	0.13	85	0.0015	40	135	09/03/1999	\$1,300,000
23	5157-01	Oakland Co	White Lake Twp	CS (Pressure Swrs) - Pontiac Lk/English Villas	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	1673	55	0.108	999999	0.0000	25	130	05/25/1999	\$4,690,000
24	5178-01	Tekonsha	Calhoun	WWTP Expnd/Upgrd	0	4	0	3	0	7	0	824	45	1.095	20	0.0547	70	122	03/05/1999	\$2,325,000
25	5165-01	Orleans Twp	Ionia Co	CS;WWTP-Long Lk Area	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	587	40	0.04	999999	0.0000	25	115	09/03/1999	\$3,080,000
26	5177-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co.	WWTP Residuals Mgt Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45693	90	13.2	165000	0.0001	25	115	03/05/1999	\$8,500,000
27	5179-01	Coopersville	Ottawa Co	PS Upgrds, FM/Swr Repl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3640	70	0.84	830	0.0010	40	110	05/25/1999	\$590,000
28	5180-01	Petosky	Emmet Co	WWTP Upard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10517	85	1.28	999999	0.0000	25	110	05/25/1999	\$5,715,000



MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SECTION, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PHONE: 517-373-216)

Michigan Clean Water State Revolving Fund

Loan Assistance Ranking For Wastewater Treatment Works Projects

Final Fiscal Year 1999 Project Priority List By Rank

Reported on: 10/02/1998 3:51:09 PM

Page 2 of 2

Rank	Project Number	Project Name And Description			Water Quality Severity Points						Enf Pts	Pop.	Pop. Pts	Exist. Disch	Rec Waters	Dil. Ratio	Rat. Pts	Tot Pts	Bind.Com Date	Bind.Com. Amt.
					DO	NUT	TOX	MICR	GWD	Tot										
29	5167-01	Petersburg, City of	Monroe County	WWTP upgrd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1191	50	0.17	33	0.0052	55	105	05/25/1999	\$810,000
30	5168-01	Berrien Springs	Berrien County	New WWTP,CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1927	60	0.29	1080	0.0003	40	100	09/03/1999	\$8,200,000
31	5139-01	Billings Twp	Gladwin Co	CS, WWTP (Grav/Press & Oxi Ditch w/Wtld Dis)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3429	70	0.24	999999	0.0000	25	95	09/03/1999	\$22,990,000
32	5152-01	Tuscarora Twp	Cheboygan Co	CS (Grav & Press Swrs) & WWTP (SBR)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2388	65	0.167	999999	0.0000	25	90	09/03/1999	\$11,830,000
33	5181-01	Bellaire	Antrim Co	WWTP Exp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1238	50	0.11	79	0.0014	40	90	05/25/1999	\$600,000
34	5176-01	Jackson County Dra	Napoleon Twp and Gra	CS, Int.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1501	55	1.17	999999	0.0000	25	80	05/25/1999	\$5,555,000
35	5171-01	Inverness Twp	Cheboygan Co	CS, WWTP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	30	0.0525	999999	0.0000	25	55	05/25/1999	\$3,200,000
45	Projects														Total Binding Commitment Dollars					\$1,502,290,000